

B. JOHN CASEY, OSB No. 120025  
john.casey@stoel.com  
RACHEL C. LEE, OSB No. 102944  
rachel.lee@stoel.com  
JACOB GOLDBERG, OSB No. 162565  
jacob.goldberg@stoel.com  
STOEL RIVES LLP  
760 SW Ninth Avenue, Suite 3000  
Portland, OR 97205  
Telephone: 503.224.3380

MATTHEW M. WOLF (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
matthew.wolf@arnoldporter.com  
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP  
601 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20001  
Telephone: 202.942.5000

*Attorneys for Defendant The Kroger Company*

(Additional counsel on signature page)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF OREGON  
PORTLAND DIVISION

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, STATE  
OF ARIZONA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, STATE OF  
ILLINOIS, STATE OF MARYLAND, STATE  
OF NEVADA, STATE OF NEW MEXICO,  
STATE OF OREGON, and STATE OF  
WYOMING,

Plaintiffs,

v.

THE KROGER COMPANY and  
ALBERTSONS COMPANIES, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 3:24-cv-00347-AN

DEFENDANTS THE KROGER  
COMPANY'S AND ALBERTSONS  
COMPANIES, INC.'S RESPONSE TO  
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AN  
EXTENSION OF TIME

## RESPONSE

Plaintiffs’ Motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 139) (“Extension Motion”) to respond to Defendants’ Motion to Compel (ECF No. 133) fails to provide this Court with the relevant background or underlying context of Plaintiffs’ Motion. For the following reasons, this Court should grant the motion only in part and allow a one-day extension to respond to Defendants’ Motion, consistent with the extension that Plaintiffs proposed several days earlier and to which Defendants have already agreed.

*First*, Plaintiffs’ Extension Motion is inconsistent with the Case Management and Scheduling Order (“CMSO”), which the parties agreed to after extensive negotiations, and which this Court entered. ECF No. 88. The CMSO sets out a deliberate procedure for addressing discovery disputes that reflects the highly-accelerated nature of this litigation and the abbreviated fact discovery period. *Id.*, Section B.17. To ensure expedient briefing and resolution of discovery disputes, the CMSO requires to parties to meet and confer within three calendar days of a request to discuss a dispute and to seek relief within five calendar days of reaching an impasse. *Id.* The CMSO further provides: “Any brief in opposition to the motion shall be filed no later than two calendar days after the motion was filed.” *Id.* The Parties agreed this was the appropriate sequence and timing for addressing discovery disputes that arise in this litigation, and Plaintiffs have not provided any declaration or other evidentiary support to depart from that governing rule.

*Second*, Plaintiffs received ample notice of the legal bases for Defendants’ Motion to Compel. Defendants conferred with Plaintiffs about their deficient interrogatory responses early last week on May 14, 2024—five days before Defendants filed their motion to compel. Plaintiffs were placed on notice that Defendants may seek relief if Plaintiffs refused to provide supplemental responses as intended by the CMSO. *See* Casey Dec., Ex. A at 5. Over the next several days,

Defendants requested several times that Plaintiffs provide their position on Defendants' intention to request an expedited hearing (as required by Local Rule 7-1(g)). *Id.* at 2–5. Defendants also twice reminded Plaintiffs that the briefing of a motion to compel would be governed by the deadlines in the CMSO. *Id.*

*Third*, Defendants agreed to a one-day extension consistent with Plaintiffs' previous proposal, and Plaintiffs provided no basis for their renewed request. Specifically, on Friday, May 17, 2024, Plaintiffs asked for three days to respond to the forthcoming motion to compel if Defendants filed that day—*i.e.*, Plaintiffs would respond on Monday if Defendants filed by 5 p.m. on Friday—but Defendants informed them as a courtesy that they did not plan to file the motion to compel that day. Casey Dec., Ex. A at 2–3.

After Defendants filed their motion to compel on May 19, 2024, Plaintiffs reached out requesting *four days* to respond—even more time than they sought when they were concerned Defendants would file on Friday and make the entire two-day response period fall in the weekend. In doing so, Plaintiffs' counsel offered no explanation for why Plaintiffs were unable to meet the agreed-upon deadline in the CMSO despite five days' notice of the narrow dispute, let alone why they now needed an even longer extension than previously proposed. Casey Dec., Exs. B, C. Defendants nonetheless offered to honor the three-day response period consistent with Plaintiffs' original request. *Id.* Plaintiffs opted to file this motion instead.

*Fourth*, time is of the essence, and Defendants will be prejudiced by any further delay. Defendants have been more than willing to grant courtesies where it does not prejudice their defense in this litigation. For example, on April 24, 2024, Defendants informed the FTC that it had failed to provide its responses and objections to Defendants' requests for production by the deadline specified in the CMSO. Casey Dec., Ex. D at 2. Without even being asked, Defendants

informed the FTC that they would hold open the period to object as a courtesy. *Id.* With 21 days remaining in the discovery period ending June 11, 2024, however, Defendants cannot allow Plaintiffs to draw this process out in spite of the deadline they agreed would govern discovery motions in the CMSO. Defendants were entitled to the critical market-related information sought in their interrogatories more than a week ago—when Plaintiffs served their deficient responses—and even an order compelling Plaintiffs to provide that information would allow Plaintiffs yet another seven days to respond under the CMSO. ECF No. 88, Section B.17. Indeed, while Plaintiffs had the benefit of more than a year of investigation prior to filing the Complaint, Defendants are forced to extract the discovery they need to effectively defend themselves entirely within the confines of this action. Every single day is valuable to Defendants as the discovery period ticks away.

### **CONCLUSION**

The Court should permit Plaintiffs three days to respond to Defendants’ motion to compel as Plaintiffs originally proposed and to which Defendants agreed.

DATED: May 21, 2024

ANGELI LAW GROUP LLC

/s/ Kristen Tranetzki

KRISTEN TRANETZKI, Bar No. 115730

kristen@angelilaw.com

DAVID H. ANGELI, Bar No. 020244

david@angelilaw.com

PETER D. HAWKES, Bar No. 071986

peter@angelilaw.com

121 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400

Portland, OR 97204

Telephone: 503.954.2232

AND

DEBEVOISE & PLIMPTON LLP

EDWARD D. HASSI (*Pro Hac Vice*)

thassi@debevoise.com

801 Pennsylvania Avenue NW

Washington, DC 20004

Telephone: 202.942.5000

MICHAEL SCHAPER (*Pro Hac Vice*)

mschaper@debevoise.com

SHANNON ROSE SELDEN (*Pro Hac Vice*)

srselden@debevoise.com

J. ROBERT ABRAHAM (*Pro Hac Vice*)

jrabraham@debevoise.com

NATASCHA BORN (*Pro Hac Vice*)

nborn@debevoise.com

66 Hudson Boulevard

New York, NY 10001

Telephone: 212.909.6000

AND

WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP

ENU A. MAINIGI (*Pro Hac Vice*)

emainigi@wc.com

JONATHAN B. PITT (*Pro Hac Vice*)

jpitt@wc.com

A. JOSHUA PODOLL (*Pro Hac Vice*)

apodoll@wc.com

THOMAS W. RYAN (*Pro Hac Vice*)

STOEL RIVES LLP

/s/ B. John Casey

B. JOHN CASEY, OSB No. 120025

john.casey@stoel.com

RACHEL C. LEE, OSB No. 102944

rachel.lee@stoel.com

JACOB GOLDBERG, OSB No. 162565

jacob.goldberg@stoel.com

AND

ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP

MATTHEW M. WOLF (*Pro Hac Vice*)

matthew.wolf@arnoldporter.com

SONIA K. PFAFFENROTH (*Pro Hac Vice*)

sonia.pfaffenroth@arnoldporter.com

JOSHUA M. DAVIS (*Pro Hac Vice*)

joshua.davis@arnoldporter.com

KOLYA D. GLICK (*Pro Hac Vice*)

kolya.glick@arnoldporter.com

JASON C. EWART (*Pro Hac Vice*)

jason.ewart@arnoldporter.com

MICHAEL E. KIENTZLE (*Pro Hac Vice*)

michael.kientzle@arnoldporter.com

MATTHEW M. SHULTZ (*Pro Hac Vice*)

matthew.shultz@arnoldporter.com

DAVID B. BERGMAN (*Pro Hac Vice*)

david.bergman@arnoldporter.com

MICHAEL L. WALDEN (*Pro Hac Vice*)

mike.walden@arnoldporter.com

YASMINE L. HARIK (*Pro Hac Vice*)

yasmine.harik@arnoldporter.com

ALLISON GARDNER (*Pro Hac Vice*)

allison.gardner@arnoldporter.com

BARBARA H. WOOTTON (*Pro Hac Vice*)

barbara.wootton@arnoldporter.com

CHRISTIAN SCHULTZ (*Pro Hac Vice*)

christian.schultz@arnoldporter.com

DAVID EMANUELSON (*Pro Hac Vice*)

david.emanuelson@arnoldporter.com

MEI-WAH LEE (*Pro Hac Vice*)

mei-wah.lee@arnoldporter.com

WILSON DELOSS MUDGE (*Pro Hac Vice*)

wilson.mudge@arnoldporter.com

tryan@wc.com  
TYLER INFINGER(*Pro Hac Vice*)  
tinfinger@wc.com  
WILLIAM ASHWORTH (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
washworth@wc.com  
680 Maine Avenue SW  
Washington, DC 20024  
Telephone: 202.434.5000

AND

DECHERT LLP

JAMES A. FISHKIN (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
james.fishkin@dechert.com  
MICHAEL COWIE (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
mike.cowie@dechert.com  
ELENA KAMENIR (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
elena.kamenir@dechert.com  
1900 K Street NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: 202.261.3300

HOWARD. M. ULLMAN (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
howard.ullman@dechert.com  
45 Fremont St, 26th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: 415.262.4500

ROSS UFBERG (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
ross.ufberg@dechert.com  
YOSEF WEITZMAN (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
yosi.weitzman@dechert.com  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19104  
Telephone: 215.994.2422

*Attorneys for Defendant Albertsons  
Companies, Inc.*

601 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20001  
Telephone: 202.942.5000

JOHN A. HOLLER (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
john.holler@arnoldporter.com  
250 W 55th Street  
New York, NY 10019  
Telephone: 212.836.8000

BRIAN K. CONDON (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
brian.condon@arnoldporter.com  
777 S. Figueroa Street, 44th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Telephone: 213.243.4000

JEREMY T. KAMRAS (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
jeremy.kamras@arnoldporter.com  
Three Embarcadero Center, 10th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: 415.471.3100

AND

WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP

MARK A. PERRY (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
mark.perry@weil.com  
LUKE SULLIVAN (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
luke.sullivan@weil.com  
JASON N. KLEINWAKS (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
jason.kleinwaks@weil.com  
2001 M Street, NW, Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20036  
Telephone: 202.682.7000

LUNA N. BARRINGTON (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
luna.barrington@weil.com  
767 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10153  
Telephone: 212.310.8000

SARAH M. STERNLIEB (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
sarah.sternlieb@weil.com  
700 Louisiana Street, Suite 3700  
Houston, TX 77002

Telephone: 713.546.5000

BAMBO OBARO (*Pro Hac Vice*)

bambo.obaro@weil.com

201 Redwood Shores Parkway

Redwood Shores, CA 94065

Telephone: 650.802.3000

THOMAS B. FIASCONE (*Pro Hac Vice*)

tom.fiascone@weil.com

REBECCA SIVITZ (*Pro Hac Vice*)

rebecca.sivitz@weil.com

100 Federal Street, Floor 34

Boston, MA 02110

Telephone: 617.722.8314

*Attorneys for Defendant The Kroger Company*